Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	Any meaningful insight into what specific changes could provide air quality improvement.	I thought most of the presentation was excellent. I do think more time could have been spent on control strategies.	More detailed chemical information of quantities of specific precursors are our area. Listing of major contributors to PM2.5 and precursors.		Reliable data requiring us to make changes in air quality standards. Not political reasons but actual scientific data requiring immediate action for health reasons.	I had hoped to learned the most preferred method, although I am guessing that will come out in future meetings.		We did not understand that we were to meet with constituency groups in a formal setting.		
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.		No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.			What are some options other states have used to address PM2.5. What options the State of Utah deems feasible for our area.				we must connect the dots between choices to waste energy and respiratory illness.		specific speciation of Ecarbon and Ocarbon sources the amount of NOX (in tons) critical to prevent elevated winter ozone. specific emission inventory conversion (at inversion conditions) to concentration of PM2.5 IE -T of Nox = X micrograms	What direction is DAQ likely to take for regulating PM2.5 based upon precurser (both primary and secondary) information?
Have you already developed your constituent group?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?		5			10					
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?		1			1		5		4	
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		5			2		5		3	
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4			2		5		3	
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		3			1		5		3	
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by personal or professional interest			Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed using DAQ website or publications			Informed by personal or professional interest		Other	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by media	
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by media			Informed by media		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest	
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)			Other		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed using DAQ website or publications		
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Other			Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed by media			

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?			The State is responsible for providing plausible solutions and options. This is an issue that takes years to understand and models to see how various options will accomplish your goals. I feel the State should have provide a discussion on options that may be viable or some other States have proposed. I feel like a school child being given assignments to make decisions that I have not been given enough information. I feel the state is trying to shift the burden onto the public. I already have a full time job and do not like to be volunteered to do the work for the State that they are getting paid to do. I will not accept assignments from the State to do their work. From what I saw , the constituent approach is very flawed. The members of the group do not have the			I am from industry. We are an equipment supplier. Our customers would like to see nothing happen as any additional regulation will add expenses to their businesses. I intend to keep them informed as we go forward, but I am finding low interest in the process. I know that is not the intent of the DAQ, as public input and by-off is vital.	league of women voters studies air quality and health effects--makes consensus positions those studies and positions are the basis for my comments		This is an important component of reaching consensus as to how to tackle the problems and reach an implementable outcome	
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?		Area	Mobile				Mobile	Mobile	Area	
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?		Mobile	Area				Area	Area	Point	
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?		Point	Point				Point	Point	Mobile	
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.		Yes	No		Yes		No		Yes	
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.		Mostly the differences between area and point sources. Also, most were suprised that area or background influence has such a large component.	I had no constituent group		Went through same info that was presented to us.		kathy van dame provides excellent information		EPA naming conventions are not particularly user friendly	
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min		60+ min		30 - 60 min	
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min		60+ min		30 - 60 min	
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min		60+ min		30 - 60 min	
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.		Yes	No		No		Yes	No	Yes	
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.		most were aware of vehicle emissions programs and point source controls.	The level of knowledge in the service group is very low and I believe inadequate to the task you are asking. You may have as much luck doing a random phone servery.				league of women voters studies and positions		Not always implementable to achieve measurable outcomes	
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest				Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups	Independent research	
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed using DAQ website or publications				Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by personal or professional interest	
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Independent research				EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups	
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Independent research					Independent research	Independent research	Other	

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Other					Other		Informed using DAQ website or publications	
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?		vehicle emission programs - including diesel testing.	Mobile		At this point no need for a reduction strategy is needed		transportation: mass available	vehicle idling rules development	Public intensive education towards behavioral changes meant to reduce the use of combustion engines of all kinds	
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	2				5	3	5	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	2				5	4	5	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	2				5	4	5	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		1	1				5	3	5	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	4				5	2	5	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		2	4				4	1	3	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	3				5	3	5	
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?			area				residential: efficient design & conservation	school bus retrofitting	Concentrating on Mobile only - fleet change to cleaner and more efficient vehicles	
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3				5	3	3	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			2				5	3	5	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3				5	3	3	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			2				5	3	3	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3				5	2	5	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3				5	2	3	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			3					3	4	

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?			Point				educate & encourage biking/walking	public transportation incentives	voluntary restriction of use during weather inversion periods	
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			1				5	3	3	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3				5	4	4	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3				5	4	5	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			2				5	2	2	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			1				5	3	4	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			1				5	3	3	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			3				5	3	3	
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?			None					maintenance reinforcement	Alternative methods of travel	
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								3	2	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								5	5	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								4	5	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								5	2	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)								3	4	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)								3	3	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)								3	2	
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?			None					develop road networks	Anti idling education	

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								2	3	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								2	5	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								2	5	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)								2	2	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)								3	4	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)									4	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)								2	4	
What time of day is best to meet?			Morning		Morning	Morning	Afternoon	Morning		
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.			No		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.			Too much time is wasted discussing the very basics. The State should use their expertice to focus the discussion and indicate their thinks on the options and what they see as the best way forward. Then the participants would have (maybe) enough common sense to make educated answers.			Three hours is great if there is information to discuss. I have set aside 3 hours.	or less			
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?			Yes		No	Yes	Yes		Yes	
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?			What is the best cost verses reduction options? What are the costs of the 3 main options? What are other States doing to address this issue. What direction does the State think is best and why.			I can tell by the first meeting that mobile sources are the most likely target for reduction. That impacts me and my customers the most. More comments on that would be great.	public education is crucial--connect the dots between individual choice and respiratory illness		For meaningful dialogue - it is imperative to educate the group of the magnitude of the problems and the options the DAQ believes are productive, implementable, and will receive EPA's agreement	